

### **REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. The Office Action mailed July 21, 2008 rejected claims 1-24. This is a full and timely response to that outstanding Office Action. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1-24 are pending. More specifically, the specification and 1 and 20-22 are amended. No new matter is added to the present application by these amendments. These amendments are specifically described hereinafter.

#### **I. Present Status of Patent Application**

Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-3, 7-18, and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Hein-Magnussen et al.* (U.S. Pub No. 2004/0132407) in view of *Burgess* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,027,575). Claims 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Hein-Magnussen et al.* (U.S. Pub No. 2004/0132407) in view of *Burgess* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,027,575) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of *Chen et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0054810). Claims 5 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Hein-Magnussen et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0132407) in view of *Burgess* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,027,575) and *Chen et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0054810) as applied to claim 4 and 1, and further in view of *Mousseau, et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,559,800). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

**II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

The Office Action rejects claims 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although Applicant respectfully disagrees, in an effort to address the Examiner's concerns and to facilitate prosecution on the merits, paragraph [0010] has been amended to eliminate propagation medium embodiments. In view of this amendment, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 22-24 should be withdrawn.

**III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

**A. Claims 1-19**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 and 7-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Hein-Magnussen et al.* (U.S. Pub No. 2004/0132407) in view of *Burgess* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,027,575). The Office Action rejects claims 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Hein-Magnussen et al.* (U.S. Pub No. 2004/0132407) in view of *Burgess* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,027,575) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of *Chen et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0054810). The Office Action rejects claims 5 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Hein-Magnussen et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0132407) in view of *Burgess* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,027,575) and *Chen et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0054810) as applied to claim 4 and 1, and further in view of *Mousseau, et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,559,800).

**Independent claim 1** as amended recites:

1. A communication method, comprising:  
***receiving by a cellular base station a wireless data request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client; providing by the cellular base station a local exchange point of presence to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence selected based on the geographic location of the wireless client;***  
and  
providing the telecommunications service to the wireless client with a local telephone number through the local exchange point of presence, wherein the cellular base station provides cellular telephone services.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose the features emphasized above. For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103, the cited combination of references must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features of the claim at issue. *See, e.g., In re Dow Chemical*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Keller*, 208 U.S.P.Q.2d 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claim 1 have rendered the rejection moot. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that the combination of *Hein-Magnussen* and *Burgess* do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least ***receiving by a cellular base station a wireless data request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client; providing by the cellular base station a local exchange point of presence to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence selected based on the geographic location of the wireless client.***

Even if, assuming for the sake of argument *Hein-Magnussen* discloses providing a unique address by a transceiver, *Hein-Magnussen* fails to disclose receiving by a cellular base station a wireless data request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client; providing by the cellular base station a local exchange point of presence to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence selected based on the geographic location of the wireless client. Even if, assuming for the sake of argument, *Burgess* discloses a cellular base station, *Burgess* fails to disclose receiving by a cellular base station a wireless data request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client; providing by the cellular base station a local exchange point of presence to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence selected based on the geographic location of the wireless client.

Additionally, no reasoning has been offered as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination obvious. The Office Action alleges that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Hein-Magnussen* and *Burgess* to have the feature(s) of cellular base station' wherein the cellular base station provides cellular telephone services, in order to provide a method for assigning telephone numbers to a communication device or line as taught by *Burgess*." (Office Action, page 5). This statement is conclusory at best.

"To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the

teachings of the references." MPEP § 706.02(j) *quoting Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Specifically, to reject a claim based upon applying a known technique to a known device, MPEP § 2143(D) states that:

Office personnel must resolve the *Graham* factual inquiries. Then, Office personnel must articulate the following:

(1) a finding that the prior art contained a "base" device (method, or product) upon which the claimed invention can be seen as an "improvement;"

(2) a finding that the prior art contained a known technique that is applicable to the base device (method, or product);

(3) a finding that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that applying the known technique would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved system; and

(4) whatever additional findings based on the *Graham* factual inquiries may be necessary, in view of the facts of the case under consideration, to explain a conclusion of obviousness.

The rationale to support a conclusion that the claim would have been obvious is that a particular known technique was recognized as part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been capable of applying this known technique to a known device (method, or product) that was ready for improvement and the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art. The Supreme Court in *KSR* noted that if the actual application of the technique would have been beyond the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, then using the technique would not have been obvious. *KSR*, 550 U.S. at \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. If any of these findings cannot be made, then this rationale cannot be used to support a conclusion that the claim would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

(Emphasis added). Thus, for at least the reason that the Office Action fails to articulate either a finding that the prior art contained a "base" device upon which the claimed invention can be seen as an "improvement," a finding that the prior art contained a

known technique that is applicable to the base device, and a finding that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that applying the known technique would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved system, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

As the cited combination of references do not disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, singularly or in combination, all the elements of claim 1, the rejection should be withdrawn for at least that reason.

For at least the reason that independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claims 2-19 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 2-19 contain all the features of independent claim 1. *See Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Jeneric/Pentron, Inc. v. Dillon Co.*, 205 F.3d 1377, 54 U.S.P.Q.2d 1086 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Wahpeton Canvas Co. v. Frontier Inc.*, 870 F.2d 1546, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Therefore, the rejection of claims 2-19 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Additionally, with regard to the rejection of claims 4 and 6, *Chen* does not make up for the deficiencies of *Hein-Magnussen* and *Burgess* noted above. Further, with regard to claims 5 and 19, *Chen* and *Mousseau* do not make up for the deficiencies of *Hein-Magnussen* and *Burgess* noted above. Therefore, claims 4-6 and 19 are considered patentable over any combination of these documents for at least the reason that claims 4-6 and 19 incorporate allowable features of claim 1 as set forth above.

B. Claim 20

The Office Action rejects claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Hein-Magnussen et al.* (U.S. Pub No. 2004/0132407) in view of *Burgess* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,027,575).

**Independent claim 20** as amended recites:

20. A communication apparatus comprising a gateway configured to:  
***receive a wireless data request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client;***  
***provide by a cellular base station a local exchange point of presence, wherein the cellular base station provides cellular telephone services to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence based on the geographic location of the wireless client;*** and  
provide the telecommunications service to the wireless client with a local telephone number through the local exchange point of presence, wherein the cellular base station provides cellular telephone services.  
(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 is patentably distinct from the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose the features emphasized above. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claim 20 have rendered the rejection moot. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 20 is allowable for at least the reason that the combination of *Hein-Magnussen* and *Burgess* do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least **receiv[ing] a wireless data request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client; provide by a cellular base station a local exchange point of presence, wherein the cellular base station provides cellular telephone services to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence based on the geographic location of the wireless client.**

Even if, assuming for the sake of argument *Hein-Magnussen* discloses providing a unique address by a transceiver, *Hein-Magnussen* fails to disclose receiving a wireless data request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client; provide by a cellular base station a local exchange point of presence, wherein the cellular base station provides cellular telephone services to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence based on the geographic location of the wireless client. Even if, assuming for the sake of argument, *Burgess* discloses a cellular base station, *Burgess* fails to disclose receiving a wireless data request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client; provide by a cellular base station a local exchange point of presence, wherein the cellular base station provides cellular telephone services to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence based on the geographic location of the wireless client.

Additionally, no reasoning has been offered as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination obvious. The Office Action alleges that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Hein-Magnussen* and *Burgess* to have the feature(s) of cellular base station' wherein the cellular base station provides cellular telephone services, in order to provide a method for assigning telephone numbers to a communication device or line as taught by *Burgess*." (Office Action, pages 11-12). This statement is conclusory at best.

"To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the



artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references." MPEP § 706.02(j) *quoting Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Specifically, to reject a claim based upon applying a known technique to a known device, MPEP § 2143(D) states that:

Office personnel must resolve the *Graham* factual inquiries. Then, Office personnel must articulate the following:

(1) a finding that the prior art contained a "base" device (method, or product) upon which the claimed invention can be seen as an "improvement;"

(2) a finding that the prior art contained a known technique that is applicable to the base device (method, or product);

(3) a finding that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that applying the known technique would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved system; and

(4) whatever additional findings based on the *Graham* factual inquiries may be necessary, in view of the facts of the case under consideration, to explain a conclusion of obviousness.

The rationale to support a conclusion that the claim would have been obvious is that a particular known technique was recognized as part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been capable of applying this known technique to a known device (method, or product) that was ready for improvement and the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art. The Supreme Court in *KSR* noted that if the actual application of the technique would have been beyond the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, then using the technique would not have been obvious. *KSR*, 550 U.S. at \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. If any of these findings cannot be made, then this rationale cannot be used to support a conclusion that the claim would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

(Emphasis added). Thus, for at least the reason that the Office Action fails to articulate either a finding that the prior art contained a "base" device upon which the claimed

invention can be seen as an "improvement," a finding that the prior art contained a known technique that is applicable to the base device, and a finding that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that applying the known technique would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved system, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

As the cited combination of references do not disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all the elements of claim 20, the rejection should be withdrawn for at least that reason.

Regarding claim 20, the Office Action has included a conclusion that "the features cellular base station; wherein the cellular base station provides cellular telephone services was well known in the art." See Office Action, page 12. Applicant traverses this finding that the subject matter is well known. Particularly in the context of the claimed combination that includes a gateway configured to: receive a request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client; provide by a cellular base station a local exchange point of presence, wherein the cellular base station provides cellular telephone services to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence based on the geographic location of the wireless client; and provide the telecommunications service to the wireless client with a local telephone number through the local exchange point of presence, the subject matter alleged to be well-known is too complex for a reasonably skilled person to consider it to be well-known to the point that no additional evidence is needed. Therefore, the conclusion that the element is well-known is improper and should be withdrawn.

C. Claim 21

The Office Action rejects claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Hein-Magnussen et al.* (U.S. Pub No. 2004/0132407) in view of *Burgess* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,027,575).

**Independent claim 21** as amended recites:

21. A communications apparatus, comprising:  
***means for receiving by a cellular base station a wireless data request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client;***

***means for providing by a cellular base station a local exchange point of presence to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence selected based on the geographic location of the wireless client;*** and

means for providing the telecommunications service to the wireless client with a local telephone number through the local exchange point of presence, wherein the cellular base station provides cellular telephone services.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is patentably distinct from the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose the features emphasized above. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claim 21 have rendered the rejection moot. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 21 is allowable for at least the reason that the combination of *Hein-Magnussen* and *Burgess* do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least **means for receiving by a cellular base station a wireless data request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client; means for providing by a cellular base station a local exchange point of presence**

**to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence selected based on the geographic location of the wireless client.**

Even if, assuming for the sake of argument *Hein-Magnussen* discloses providing a unique address by a transceiver, *Hein-Magnussen* fails to disclose means for receiving by a cellular base station a wireless data request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client; means for providing by a cellular base station a local exchange point of presence to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence selected based on the geographic location of the wireless client. Even if, assuming for the sake of argument, *Burgess* discloses a cellular base station, *Burgess* fails to disclose means for receiving by a cellular base station a wireless data request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client; means for providing by a cellular base station a local exchange point of presence to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence selected based on the geographic location of the wireless client.

Additionally, no reasoning has been offered as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination obvious. The Office Action alleges that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hein-Magnussen and Burgess to have the feature(s) of cellular base station' wherein the cellular base station provides cellular telephone services, in order to provide a method for assigning telephone numbers to a communication device or line as taught by Burgess." (Office Action, page 13). This statement is conclusory at best.

"To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references." MPEP § 706.02(j) *quoting Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Specifically, to reject a claim based upon applying a known technique to a known device, MPEP § 2143(D) states that:

Office personnel must resolve the *Graham* factual inquiries. Then, Office personnel must articulate the following:

(1) a finding that the prior art contained a "base" device (method, or product) upon which the claimed invention can be seen as an "improvement;"

(2) a finding that the prior art contained a known technique that is applicable to the base device (method, or product);

(3) a finding that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that applying the known technique would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved system; and

(4) whatever additional findings based on the *Graham* factual inquiries may be necessary, in view of the facts of the case under consideration, to explain a conclusion of obviousness.

The rationale to support a conclusion that the claim would have been obvious is that a particular known technique was recognized as part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been capable of applying this known technique to a known device (method, or product) that was ready for improvement and the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art. The Supreme Court in *KSR* noted that if the actual application of the technique would have been beyond the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, then using the technique would not have been obvious. *KSR*, 550 U.S. at \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. If any of these findings cannot be made, then this rationale cannot be used to support a

conclusion that the claim would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

(Emphasis added). Thus, for at least the reason that the Office Action fails to articulate either a finding that the prior art contained a "base" device upon which the claimed invention can be seen as an "improvement," a finding that the prior art contained a known technique that is applicable to the base device, and a finding that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that applying the known technique would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved system, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

As the cited combination of references do not disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all the elements of claim 21, the rejection should be withdrawn for at least that reason.

Regarding claim 21, the Office Action has included a conclusion that "the features cellular base station; wherein the cellular base station provides cellular telephone services was well known in the art." See Office Action, page 14. Applicant traverses this finding that the subject matter is well known. Particularly in the context of the claimed combination that includes means for receiving a request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client; means for providing by a cellular base station a local exchange point of presence to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence selected based on the geographic location of the wireless client; and means for providing the telecommunications service to the wireless client with a local telephone number through the local exchange point of presence, the subject matter alleged to be well-known is too complex for a reasonably

skilled person to consider it to be well-known to the point that no additional evidence is needed. Therefore, the conclusion that the element is well-known is improper and should be withdrawn.

D. Claims 22-24

The Office Action rejects claims 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Hein-Magnussen et al.* (U.S. Pub No. 2004/0132407) in view of *Burgess* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,027,575).

**Independent claim 22** as amended recites:

22. A computer-readable medium encoded with a program executable by a computer comprising:  
***logic configured to receive by a cellular base station a wireless data request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client;***  
***logic configured to provide by a cellular base station a local exchange point of presence to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence selected based on the geographic location of the wireless client;*** and  
logic configured to provide the telecommunications service to the wireless client with a local telephone number through the local exchange point of presence, wherein the cellular base station provides cellular telephone services.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 is patentably distinct from the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose the features emphasized above. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claim 22 have rendered the rejection moot. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 22 is allowable for at least the reason that the combination of *Hein-Magnussen* and *Burgess* do not

disclose, teach, or suggest at least **logic configured to receive by a cellular base station a wireless data request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client; and logic configured to provide by a cellular base station a local exchange point of presence to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence selected based on the geographic location of the wireless client.**

Even if, assuming for the sake of argument *Hein-Magnussen* discloses providing a unique address by a transceiver, *Hein-Magnussen* fails to disclose logic configured to receive by a cellular base station a wireless data request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client; and logic configured to provide by a cellular base station a local exchange point of presence to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence selected based on the geographic location of the wireless client. Even if, assuming for the sake of argument, *Burgess* discloses a cellular base station, *Burgess* fails to disclose logic configured to receive by a cellular base station a wireless data request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client; and logic configured to provide by a cellular base station a local exchange point of presence to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence selected based on the geographic location of the wireless client.

Additionally, no reasoning has been offered as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination obvious. The Office Action alleges that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Hein-Magnussen* and *Burgess* to have the feature(s) of cellular base station' wherein the cellular base station provides cellular telephone



services, in order to provide a method for assigning telephone numbers to a communication device or line as taught by Burgess." (Office Action, pages 14-15). This statement is conclusory at best.

"To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references." MPEP § 706.02(j) *quoting Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Specifically, to reject a claim based upon applying a known technique to a known device, MPEP § 2143(D) states that:

Office personnel must resolve the *Graham* factual inquiries. Then, Office personnel must articulate the following:

(1) a finding that the prior art contained a "base" device (method, or product) upon which the claimed invention can be seen as an "improvement;"

(2) a finding that the prior art contained a known technique that is applicable to the base device (method, or product);

(3) a finding that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that applying the known technique would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved system; and

(4) whatever additional findings based on the *Graham* factual inquiries may be necessary, in view of the facts of the case under consideration, to explain a conclusion of obviousness.

The rationale to support a conclusion that the claim would have been obvious is that a particular known technique was recognized as part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been capable of applying this known technique to a known device (method, or product) that was ready for improvement and the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in

the art. The Supreme Court in *KSR* noted that if the actual application of the technique would have been beyond the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, then using the technique would not have been obvious. *KSR*, 550 U.S. at \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. If any of these findings cannot be made, then this rationale cannot be used to support a conclusion that the claim would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

(Emphasis added). Thus, for at least the reason that the Office Action fails to articulate either a finding that the prior art contained a "base" device upon which the claimed invention can be seen as an "improvement," a finding that the prior art contained a known technique that is applicable to the base device, and a finding that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that applying the known technique would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved system, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

As the cited combination of references do not disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all the elements of claim 22, the rejection should be withdrawn for at least that reason.

For at least the reason that independent claim 22 is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claims 23 and 24 (which depend from independent claim 22) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 23 and 24 contain all the features of independent claim 22. Therefore, the rejection of claims 23 and 24 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Regarding claim 22, the Office Action has included a conclusion that "the features cellular base station; wherein the cellular base station provides cellular telephone services was well known in the art." See Office Action, page 15. Applicant traverses this finding that the subject matter is well known. Particularly in the context of

the claimed combination that includes logic configured to receive a request for a telecommunications service from a wireless client; logic configured to provide by a cellular base station a local exchange point of presence to the wireless client in response to the request, the local exchange point of presence selected based on the geographic location of the wireless client; and logic configured to provide the telecommunications service to the wireless client with a local telephone number through the local exchange point of presence, the subject matter alleged to be well-known is too complex for a reasonably skilled person to consider it to be well-known to the point that no additional evidence is needed. Therefore, the conclusion that the element is well-known is improper and should be withdrawn.

#### **IV. Miscellaneous Issues**

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-24 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those which may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

/BAB/

**Benjamin A. Balser, Reg. No. 58,169**

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,  
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**  
Suite 1500  
600 Galleria Parkway  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339  
(770) 933-9500  
Customer No.: 38823